arXiv:math/0507345v1 [math.DS] 17 Jul 2005

On Dynamical Systems With Slow Recurrence Time [*]

Shkredov I.D.

1. Introduction.

Let X be a set with Borel sigma–algebra of measurable sets $\mathcal{B}$. Let T be a transformation of X into itself, preserving a measure μ and let us assume that measure of X is equal to 1. $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ is called a measure–preserving dynamical system. The well–known **H. Poincaré's Recurrence Theorem** [10] asserts that for any measurable set $E \subseteq X$, $\mu E > 0$ there exists a natural number n such that $\mu(E \cap T^{-n}E) > 0$.

Suppose, in addition, X is a metric space with metric $d(\cdot,\cdot)$. In the case Poincaré's Theorem can be reformulate as

Theorem 1.1 (H. Poincaré) *Let X be a metric space with metric $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ and Borel sigma–algebra of measurable sets $\mathcal{B}$. Suppose T is a measure–preserving transformation of X into itself. Then for almost every point $x \in X$ the following inequality holds*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \; d(T^n x, x) = 0\,.$$

Poincaré's Theorem was generalized by H. Furstenberg, Y. Katznelson and D. Ornstein in [11, 12].

Theorem 1.2 (H. Furstenberg, Y. Katznelson, D. Ornstein) *Let X be a set with Borel sigma–algebra of measurable sets $\mathcal{B}$. Let T be a measure–preserving transformation of X into itself and $k \ge 3$. Then for any measurable set E, $\mu E > 0$ there exists a natural number n such that*

$$\mu(E \cap T^{-n}E \cap T^{-2n}E \cap \ldots \cap T^{-(k-1)n}E) > 0\,.$$

---

[*] This work was supported by the program "Leading Scientific Schools" (project no. 136.2003.1), by RFFI grant no. 02–01–00912 and INTAS (grant no. 03–51–5-70).

If X is a metric space then Theorem 1.2 can be rewrite as

Theorem 1.2$'$ (H. Furstenberg, Y. Katznelson, D. Ornstein) *Let X be a metric space with metric $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ and Borel sigma–algebra of measurable sets $\mathcal{B}$. Suppose T is a measure–preserving transformation of X into itself and $k \geq 3$. Then for almost every point $x \in X$*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \ \max\{d(T^n x, x), d(T^{2n}x, x), \ldots, d(T^{(k-1)n}x, x)\} = 0\,.$$

In fact, Furstenberg proved a more general result. He proved that powers of transformation T in Theorem 1.2 can be replaced by any finite number of commutative transformations.

Theorem 1.3 (H. Furstenberg) *Let X be a metric space with metric $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ and Borel sigma–algebra of measurable sets $\mathcal{B}$. Suppose $k \geq 2$ and $T_1, T_2, \ldots T_k$ are commutative measure–preserving transformations. Then for almost every point $x \in X$*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \ \max\{d(T_1^n x, x), d(T_2^n x, x), \ldots, d(T_k^n x, x)\} = 0\,.$$

Let A be a subset of positive integers. By $[N]$ denote the segment $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$. The *upper density* of a set A is defined to be

$$D^*(A) = \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{|A \cap [N]|}{N}\ ,$$

where $|A \cap [N]|$ is the cardinality of $A \cap [N]$.

As was showed in [11] Theorem 1.2 is equivalent of the famous E. Szemerédi's Theorem on arithmetic progressions.

Theorem 1.4 (E. Szemerédi) *Let A be a subset of positive integers and $D^*(A) > 0$. Then for any natural number $k \geq 3$ the set A contains an arithmetic progression of the length k.*

It is easy to see that Theorem 1.4 implies Theorems 1.2 and 1.2$'$ (see [11]). In fact, Theorem 1.2 (1.2$'$) and Theorem 1.4 are equivalent statements. To prove this Furstenberg obtained the following beautiful result which is called *Furstenberg's Correspondence Principle.*

Theorem 1.5 (H. Furstenberg) *Let A be a subset of positive integers with $D^*(A) > 0$. Then there exists a dynamical system $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ and a* *measurable set E, $\mu E = D^*(A)$ such that for all integers $k \geq 3$ and all integers $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{k-1} \geq 1$,*

$$D^*(A \cap (A+m_1) \cap \ldots \cap (A+m_{k-1})) \geq \mu(E \cap T^{-m_1}E \cap \ldots \cap T^{-m_{k-1}}E)\,. \quad (1)$$

Theorem 1.5 shows that there is a close connection between Ergodic Theory and some combinatorial problems concerning arithmetic progressions.

Statement 1.6 (H. Furstenberg) *Theorems 1.2 and 1.5 imply Theorem 1.4.*

Proof. Let k be a natural number, $k \geq 3$. Suppose that a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ does not contain arithmetic progressions of the length k and has positive upper density. Using Theorem 1.5, we obtain a dynamical system $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ and a measurable set E of positive measure such that for all integers $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{k-1} \geq 1$ the inequality (1) holds. On the other hand, using Theorem 1.2, we get a natural n such that

$$\mu(E \cap T^{-n}E \cap T^{-2n}E \cap \ldots \cap T^{-(k-1)n}E) > 0\,. \quad (2)$$

Put $m_1 = n, m_2 = 2n, \ldots, m_{k-1} = (k-1)n$. Then (1) and (2) imply $D^*(A \cap (A+n) \cap \ldots \cap (A+(k-1)n)) > 0$. By assumption A does not contain arithmetic progressions of the length k. This completes the proof.

The main goal of this article is to obtain quantitative analog of Theorem 1.5. To formulate our result we need in some definitions.

Let us consider a measure $H_h(\cdot)$ on X, defined as

$$H_h(E) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} H_h^\delta(E)\,, \quad (3)$$

where $h(t)$ is a positive $(h(0) = 0)$ continuous increasing function and $H_h^\delta(E) = \inf_\tau \{\sum h(\delta_j)\}$, when τ runs through all countable coverings E by open sets $\{B_j\}$, $diam(B_j) = \delta_j < \delta$.
If $h(t) = t^\alpha$, then we get the ordinary Hausdorff measure $H_\alpha(\cdot)$.

Generally speaking, $H_h(\cdot)$ is an outer measure but it is sigma–additive measure on Carathéodory's sigma–algebra of measurable sets (see [13] for details). It is well–known that this sigma–algebra contains all Borel sets.

We shall say that a measure μ is congruent to a measure H_h, if any μ–measurable set is H_h–measurable (in the sense of Carathéodory)

Definition 1.7 Let

$$C(x) = \liminf_{n \to \infty} \{n \cdot h(d(T^n x, x))\}\,.$$

The function $C(x)$ is called *constant of recurrence* for point x.

The first quantitative version of Theorem 1.1 was proved by M. Boshernitzan in [13]. (A similar result was obtained independently by N.G. Moshchevitin in [14]).

Theorem 1.8 (M. Boshernitzan) *Let X be a metric space with $H_h(X) < \infty$ and T be a measure–preserving transformation of X into itself. Assume that μ is congruent to H_h. Then for almost every point $x \in X$ we have $C(x) < \infty$.*

The following result (see [15]) improves Theorem 1.8.

Theorem 1.9 *Let X be a metric space with $H_h(X) < \infty$ and T be a measure–preserving transformation of X into itself. Assume that μ is congruent to H_h. Then the function $C(x)$ is μ–integrable and for any μ–measurable set A, we have*

$$\int_A C(x)d\mu \le H_h(A). \tag{4}$$

If $H_h(A) = 0$, then $\int_A C(x)d\mu = 0$ with no demand on measures μ and H_h to be congruent.

Note 1.10 According to an example from §7 of paper [13] the inequality (4) is best possible.

Let us return to Theorems 1.2 and 1.4.

Suppose N and k are natural numbers, $k \ge 3$. We set

$$a_k(N) = \frac{1}{N}\max\{|A| \ : \ A \subseteq [1, N],$$

$$A \text{ contains no arithmetic progressions of length } k\},$$

Clearly, Theorem 1.4 can be reformulate as $\lim_{N\to\infty} a_k(N) = 0$ for all $k \ge 3$.

The first result concerning the rate at which $a_k(N)$ approaches zero in the case of $k = 3$ was obtained by K.F. Roth (see [3]). In his paper Roth used the Hardy – Littlewood method to prove the inequality

$$a_3(N) \ll \frac{1}{\log\log N}.$$

In other words Roth obtained a quantitative version of Theorem 1.4 and therefore Theorem 1.2 in the case of k equals three.

At present, the best upper bound for $a_3(N)$ is due to J. Bourgain. He proved that

$$a_3(N) \ll \sqrt{\frac{\log\log N}{\log N}}\,. \tag{5}$$

In [6] W.T. Gowers obtained a quantitative result concerning the rate at which $a_k(N)$ approaches zero for all $k \geq 4$.

Theorem 1.11 (W.T. Gowers) *For all $k \geq 4$ the following inequality holds $a_k(N) \ll 1/(\log\log N)^{c_k}$, where c_k is an absolute constant depends on k only.*

A. Behrend [7] obtained a lower bound for $a_3(N)$. His result was generalized by R. Rankin in [8] in the case of all $k \geq 3$ (see also [9]).

Theorem 1.12 (A. Behrend, R. Rankin) *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary real number and $k \geq 3$ be a natural. Then for all sufficiently large N the following inequality holds*

$$a_k(N) \geq \exp(-(1+\varepsilon)C_k(\log N)^{1/(k+1)})\,,$$

where C_k is an absolute positive constant depends on k only.

In the case of $k = 2$ quantitative version of Theorem 1.3 was obtained in [16, 17] and improved in [19]. Consider the two–dimensional lattice $[1,N]^2$ with basis $\{(1,0),\ (0,1)\}$. Let

$$L(N) = \frac{1}{N^2}\max\{\ |A|\ :\ A \subseteq [1,N]^2 \ \text{ and}$$

$$A \text{ contains no triples of the form } (k,m),\ (k+d,m),\ (k,m+d),\ d>0\}. \quad (6)$$

Theorem 1.13 *We have $L(N) \ll 1/(\log\log N)^{C'}$, where C' is an absolute constant.*

This inequality implies a result concerning recurrence time in Theorem 1.3 in the case of $k = 3$ (see [18]). Suppose S and R are two *commutative* measure–preserving transformations of X.

Definition 1.14 By $C_{S,R}(x)$ denote the function

$$C_{S,R}(x) = \liminf_{n\to\infty}\ \{L^{-1}(n)\cdot\max\{h(d(S^n x,x)), h(d(R^n x,x))\}\}\,,$$

where $L^{-1}(n) = 1/L(n)$. $C_{S,R}(x)$ is called *constant of multiple recurrence* for point x.

Theorem 1.15 *Let X be a metric space with $H_h(X) = C < \infty$ and let S, R be two commutative measure–preserving transformation of X. Assume that μ is congruent to H_h. Then the function $C_{S,R}(x)$ is μ–integrable and for any μ–measurable set A*

$$\int_A C_{S,R}(x)d\mu \leq H_h(A).$$

If $H_h(A) = 0$ *then* $\int_A C_{S,R}(x) d\mu = 0$ *with no demand on measures* μ *and* H_h *to be congruent.*

Let us formulate our main result.

Let k be a natural number, $k \geq 3$. Suppose that for any natural N there exists a nonempty set $A^{(N)} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}_N$ without arithmetic progressions of the length k. By $\rho(N)$ denote the density of $A^{(N)}$ in $\mathbf{Z}_N$, $\rho(N) = |A^{(N)}|/N$. We have $\rho(1) = 1$. Since $A^{(N)}$ contains no arithmetic progressions in $\mathbf{Z}_N$ it follows that $A^{(N)}$ has no arithmetic progressions in $\mathbf{Z}$. By Theorem 1.4 we have $\rho(N) \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. Assume that $\rho(N)$ is a non–increasing function.

Theorem 1.16 *Let* $\psi : \mathbf{N} \to \mathbf{R}^+$ *be a monotonically increasing function,* $X = [0, 1]$ *and* μ *is Lebesgue measure on* X. *Then there exists a dynamical system* $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T, d)$ *such that* μ *is congruent to Hausdorff measure* H_1, $H_1(X) = 0$ *and for almost every point* $x \in X$

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \{\rho^{-1}(n)\psi(n) \max\{d(T^n x, x), d(T^{2n} x, x), \ldots, d(T^{(k-1)n} x, x)\}\} \geq 1 \,, \tag{7}$$

where $\rho^{-1}(n) = 1/\rho(n)$.

Note 1.17 The identity $H_1(X) = 0$ in Theorem 1.16 is very important. If this equality is not true then our Theorem is trivial, because one can find a metric d such that X has infinite Hausdorff measure $H_1(X)$ and lower limit in (7) is equal to $+\infty$. In addition, it is easy to see that the identity $H_1(X) = 0$ can be replaced by stronger equality $H_{tg(t)} = 0$, where $g(t)$ is some monotonically non–increasing function, $g(t) \to +\infty$ as $t \to 0+$.

In Theorem 1.16 we use dense sets without arithmetic progression to construct a dynamical system with slow time of multiple recurrence. But the main idea of Theorem 1.5 is the same. Indeed, let $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ be a set without arithmetic progressions and $D^*(A) > 0$. By Furstenberg's Correspondence Principle there exists a dynamical system and a measurable set E, $\mu E > 0$ such that for all natural numbers n we have $\mu(E \cap T^{-n} E \cap \ldots \cap T^{-(k-1)n} E) = 0$. In other words, we obtain the dynamical system without multiple recurrence. (Certainly, this contradicts Theorem 1.2 and we can derive Szemerédi's Theorem from the Theorem on multiple recurrence, see Statement 1.6). Thus Theorem 1.16 is a quantitative analog of Theorem 1.5.

In section 3 we shall consider a question concerning possible values of one–dimensional recurrence constant $C(x)$.

The constructions which we use develop the approach of paper [13] and book [11].

2. Proof of Theorem 1.16.

We need in the following simple Lemma. In fact, this Lemma was proved in [20]. Another proof can be found in [21].

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose* N *is a natural number,* A *is a nonempty subset of* $\mathbf{Z}_N$ *and* $\varphi \ge 1$ *is a real number. Then there exist residues* $a_1, \dots, a_l \in \mathbf{Z}_N$ *and a partition of* $\mathbf{Z}_N$ *into sets* $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_l$ *and* B *such that*
1) $A_i \subseteq A + a_i$ *for all* $i = 1, \dots, l$.
2) $|A_i| \ge |A|/\varphi$ *for all* $i = 1, \dots, l$.
3) $|B| \le N/\varphi$.

Proof. The proof of the Lemma is a sort of an inductive process. At the nth step of our process sets $A_1, \dots, A_n$, residues $a_1, \dots, a_n$ and auxiliary sets $B_1, \dots, B_n$ will be constructed. Besides that we will have $B_1 \supseteq B_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq B_n$.

Let $n = 1$. We set $a_1 = 0$, $A_1 = A$ and $B_1 = \mathbf{Z}_N \setminus A_1$. If $|B_1| \le N/\varphi$ then Lemma 2.1 is proved. Indeed, let $B = B_1$. Clearly, the sets A_1, B and the residues a_1 satisfy 1)—3).

Suppose at the nth step of our procedure the sets $A_1, \dots, A_n$ and residues $a_1, \dots, a_n$ are constructed. Let $B_n = \mathbf{Z}_N \setminus (\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n A_i)$. If $|B_n| \le N/\varphi$ then Lemma 2.1 is proved. Indeed, put $B = B_n$. Clearly, the sets $A_1, \dots, A_n$, B and residues $a_1, \dots, a_n$ satisfy 1)—3).

Let $|B_n| > N/\varphi$. We have

$$\sum_{t \in \mathbf{Z}_N} |B_n \cap (A + t)| = |A||B_n| \ge \frac{N|A|}{\varphi} \,. \tag{8}$$

Hence there exists $t \in \mathbf{Z}_N$ such that $|B_n \cap (A + t)| \ge |A|/\varphi$. Put $a_{n+1} = t$ and $A_{n+1} = B_n \cap (A + a_{n+1})$. Then for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ we get $A_{n+1} \cap A_i = \emptyset$. Besides that $A_{n+1} \subseteq A + a_{n+1}$.

For any i we have $|A_i| \ge |A|/\varphi > 0$. This implies that our process stops at step K, $K \le [N\varphi/|A|] + 1$. This completes the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.16. Let α_m be an arbitrary non–increasing sequence of real numbers $\alpha_m \in (0, 1)$, α_m tends to zero as m tends to infinity. The function $\psi(n)$ is defined on positive integers. Denote by the same letter $\psi(t)$ the result of linear extension of $\psi(n)$ to the entire $\mathbf{R}$. We obtain the continuous monotonically increasing function. Let $\varphi(t) = \sqrt{\psi(t)}$ and $\varphi^*(t) = \max\{1, \varphi(t)\}$. Let also $N_0 \le N_1 \le \dots \le N_m \le \dots$ be a non–increasing sequence of integer numbers, where $N_0 = 1$ and for all $m \ge 1$ we have $N_m = \lceil \varphi^{-1}(2\alpha_m^{-1}\varphi^*(2)N_0N_1\dots N_{m-1})\rceil$. Here φ^{-1} is the inverse function. We have $N_m \geq 2$, $m \geq 1$.

Let X be a space of sequences $(x_1, x_2, \dots)$, $0 \leq x_i < N_i$, $i \geq 1$. $C(a_1, \dots, a_l) = \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in X \ : \ x_1 = a_1, \dots, x_l = a_l\}$ is called *elementary cylinder* of rank l. We can associate with the sequence $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in X$ the real number $x \to \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_i}{N_0N_1\dots N_i} \in [0,1]$. Thus, X can be considered as the segment $[0,1]$.

Let a be a positive integer, $N \in \mathbf{N}$. By $a^+(N)$ define the number $a+1 \pmod N$. Let T be a transformation of the space X into itself such that $Tx = y$, $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$, $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots)$, where

$$y_1 = x_1^+(N_1)\,,$$

$$y_2 = \begin{cases} x_2^+(N_1), & \text{if } x_1 + 1 = N_1 \\ y_2, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\dots$$

$$y_m = \begin{cases} x_m^+(N_1), & \text{if } x_1 + 1 = N_1, x_2 + 1 = N_2, \dots, x_{m-1} + 1 = N_{m-1} \\ y_m, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\dots$$

The space X has a natural group operation $+$. We have $Tx = x + 1$, where $1 = (1, 0, 0, \dots)$. Clearly, T preserves Haar measure μ and this Haar measure coincides with Lebesgue measure. Elementary cylinder of rank l has measure $1/(N_0N_1\dots N_l)$.

Consider an arbitrary N_s. By assumption there exists a non–empty set $A^{(N_s)} = A^{(s)} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}_{N_s}$ without arithmetic progressions of the length k. Using Lemma 2.1 for $A^{(s)}$ and $\varphi = \varphi(N_s)$, we obtain the sets $A_1^{(s)}, \dots, A_l^{(s)}$, $l = l(s)$ and $B^{(s)}$ satisfy 1)—3).

Let $x, y \in X$, $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$, $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots)$. Consider the function

$$d(x,y) = \{\psi^{-1}(N_0 \dots N_m)\rho(N_0 \dots N_m)\,, \text{ where } m \text{ is the maximal integer s.t.}$$

$$x_1 = y_1, \dots, x_{m-1} = y_{m-1} \text{ and either there exists } i \in 1, 2, \dots, l(m) \text{ s.t.}$$

$$x_m, y_m \in A_i^{(m)} \text{ or } x_m, y_m \in B^{(m)}\}\,,$$

where $\psi^{-1} = 1/\psi$. It is easy to see that $d(x,y)$ is a non–archimedean metric on X. Let us consider Hausdorff measure H_1 on the space X. Any elementary cylinder is a closed set therefore it is a Borel set in the metric space (X,d). It follows that the measure μ is congruent to H_1.

Let us prove that $H_1(X) = 0$. Let δ be an arbitrary positive number. Since $\rho(N) \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$ it follows that there exists a natural m such that $\rho(N_0 \dots N_m)/\psi(N_0 \dots N_m) < \delta$. Let us consider the following partition of X into

$$U_i(\vec{a}) = \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in X \ : \ x_1 = a_1, \dots, x_{m-1} = a_{m-1}, x_m \in A_i^{(m)}\}\, , i = 1, \dots, l(m)$$

and

$$B(\vec{a}) = \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in X \ : \ x_1 = a_1, \dots, x_{m-1} = a_{m-1}, x_m \in B^{(m)}\}\, ,$$

where $\vec{a} \in [N_1] \times \ldots \times [N_{m-1}] := F_{m-1}$. We obtain

$$X = \bigsqcup_{\vec{a} \in F_{m-1}} \left(B(\vec{a}) \bigsqcup \left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^{l(m)} U_i(\vec{a}) \right) \right) \, .$$

For any $\vec{a} \in F_{m-1}$ and any $i \in 1, 2, \dots, l(m)$ we have $\mathrm{diam} U_i(\vec{a}) \le \rho(N_0 \dots N_m)/\psi(N_0 \dots N_m) < \delta$. Similarly, for any $\vec{a} \in F_{m-1}$ we get $\mathrm{diam} B(\vec{a}) \le \rho(N_0 \dots N_m)/\psi(N_0 \dots N_m) < \delta$. Using 2) of Lemma 2.1, we obtain $l(m) \le N_m \varphi(N_m)/|A^{(m)}| = \varphi(N_m)/\rho(N_m)$. Hence

$$H_1^\delta(X) \le |F_{m-1}| \left(\frac{\varphi(N_m)}{\rho(N_m)} + 1 \right) \frac{\rho(N_0 \dots N_m)}{\psi(N_0 \dots N_m)} \le$$

$$\le 2N_0 \dots N_{m-1} \frac{\varphi(N_m)\rho(N_0 \dots N_m)}{\rho(N_m)\psi(N_0 \dots N_m)} \le 2N_0 \dots N_{m-1} \frac{\varphi(N_m)}{\psi(N_m)} \, .$$

We have $N_m \ge \varphi^{-1}(2\alpha_m^{-1} N_0 \dots N_{m-1})$. This implies that $2N_0 \dots N_{m-1} \le \alpha_m \varphi(N_m)$. Using this inequality, we get

$$H_1^\delta(X) \le \alpha_m \frac{\varphi^2(N_m)}{\psi(N_m)} \le \alpha_m \, .$$

Since $\alpha_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$ it follows that $H_1(X) = 0$.

Let us prove (7).

Let

$$\tilde{B}^{(s)} = \{x \in X \ : \ x_s \in B^{(s)}\} \subseteq X \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{+\infty} \bigcup_{s \ge n}^{+\infty} \tilde{B}^{(s)} \, .$$

We have $\mu(\tilde{B}^{(s)}) = |B^{(s)}|/N_s \leq 1/\varphi(N_s)$. Since $\varphi(N_s) \geq N_0 \ldots N_{s-1}$, $s \geq 1$ and $N_s \geq 2$, $s \geq 1$ it follows that

$$\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \mu(\tilde{B}^{(s)}) \leq \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(N_s)} \leq \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N_0 \ldots N_{s-1}} < \infty\,. \tag{9}$$

Using Borel–Cantelli Lemma, we get $\mu\mathbf{B} = 0$.

Let us prove that (7) holds for any $x \notin \mathbf{B}$.

Let $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots) \in X \setminus \mathbf{B}$. Since $x \notin \mathbf{B}$ it follows that there exists a number $M = M(x) \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$ we have $x_n \notin B^{(n)}$. Let m_0 be a natural such that $N_0 \ldots N_{m_0-1} < M \leq N_0 \ldots N_{m_0}$.

Prove that for any $n \geq N_0 \ldots N_{m_0}$ the following inequality holds

$$\rho^{-1}(n)\psi(n) \cdot \max\{d(T^n x, x), d(T^{2n}x, x), \ldots, d(T^{(k-1)n}x, x)\} \geq 1\,. \tag{10}$$

Let $m_1 \geq m_0$ be a natural number. Suppose that for some $n > 0$ such that

$$N_0 \ldots N_{m_1} \leq n < N_0 \ldots N_{m_1+1} \tag{11}$$

(10) does not hold. Then

$$d(T^n x, x),\ d(T^{2n}x, x),\ \ldots,\ d(T^{(k-1)n}x, x) < \rho(N_0 \ldots N_{m_1})\psi^{-1}(N_0 \ldots N_{m_1})\,.$$

Let $y^{(1)} = T^n x, y^{(2)} = T^{2n}x, \ldots, y^{(k-1)} = T^{(k-1)n}x$. Using properties of metric $d(x, y)$, we obtain

$$d(y^{(1)}, x), \ldots, d(y^{(k-1)}, x) \leq \rho(N_0 \ldots N_{m_1+1})\psi^{-1}(N_0 \ldots N_{m_1+1})\,.$$

It follows that

$$x_1 = y_1^{(1)} = \ldots = y_1^{(k-1)},\ \ldots\ , x_{m_1} = y_{m_1}^{(1)} = \ldots = y_{m_1}^{(k-1)}$$

$$\text{and there exists } i \text{ such that } x_{m_1+1}, y_{m_1+1}^{(1)}, \ldots, y_{m_1+1}^{(k-1)} \in A_i^{(m_1+1)}\,. \tag{12}$$

We have $n = y^{(1)} - x = y^{(2)} - y^{(1)} = \ldots = y^{(k-1)} - y^{(k-2)}$. Using (12), we get

$$y^{(1)} - x = (\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{m_1}, (y_{m_1+1}^{(1)} - x_{m_1+1}) \pmod{N_{m_1+1}}, w_1, w_2, \ldots)\,,$$

$$y^{(2)} - y^{(1)} = (\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{m_1}, (y_{m_1+1}^{(2)} - y_{m_1+1}^{(1)}) \pmod{N_{m_1+1}}, w_1', w_2', \ldots)\,, \ldots\,,$$

$$y^{(k-1)} - y^{(k-2)} = (\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{m_1}, (y^{(k-1)}_{m_1+1} - y^{(k-2)}_{m_1+1}) \pmod{N_{m_1+1}}, w''_1, w''_2, \ldots)\,,$$

where $w_1, w_2, \ldots,$ $w'_1, w'_2, \ldots$ and $w''_1, w''_2, \ldots$ are some numbers. It follows that
$x_{m_1+1}, y^{(1)}_{m_1+1}, \ldots, y^{(k-1)}_{m_1+1}$ is an arithmetic progression of length k in $\mathbf{Z}_{N_{m_1+1}}$. We have $x_{m_1+1}, y^{(1)}_{m_1+1}, \ldots, y^{(k-1)}_{m_1+1} \in A^{(m_1+1)}_i$. Since $A^{(m_1+1)}_i \subseteq A^{(m_1+1)} + p$ for some $p \in \mathbf{Z}_{N_{m_1+1}}$ it follows that $A^{(m_1+1)}_i$ contains no arithmetic progressions of the length k in $\mathbf{Z}_{N_{m_1+1}}$. Hence for any $l = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$ we have $x_{m_1+1} \equiv y^{(l)}_{m_1+1} \pmod{N_{m_1+1}}$. Since $0 \le x_{m_1+1}, y^{(1)}_{m_1+1}, \ldots, y^{(k-1)}_{m_1+1} < N_{m_1+1}$ it yields that $x_{m_1+1} = y^{(1)}_{m_1+1} = \ldots = y^{(k-1)}_{m_1+1}$. Hence

$$n = y^{(1)} - x = (\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{m_1+1}, n_{m_1+2}, n_{m_1+3}, \ldots)\,. \tag{13}$$

Using (13), we get $n \ge N_0 \ldots N_{m_1+1}$. This contradicts (11). Theorem 1.16 is proved.

Corollary 2.2 *Let k be an integer, $k \ge 3$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an absolute positive constant C_k depends on k only and a dynamical system $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T, d)$, $X = [0,1]$, μ is Lebesgue measure such that μ is congruent to Hausdorff measure H_1, $H_1(X) = 0$ and for almost every point $x \in X$*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \{\rho^{-1}(n) \max\{d(T^n x, x), d(T^{2n} x, x), \ldots, d(T^{(k-1)n} x, x)\}\} \ge 1\,, \tag{14}$$

where $\rho^{-1}(n) = 1/\rho(n)$ and $\rho(n) = \exp(-(1+\varepsilon) C_k (\log n)^{1/(k+1)})$.
Proof. By Theorem 1.12 for any integer $k \ge 3$ and for all sufficiently large N there exists a set $A^{(N)}_0 \subseteq [1, 2, \ldots, N)$ contains no arithmetical progressions of the length k such that $|A^{(N)}_0| \ge N \exp(-(1+\varepsilon) C_k (\log N)^{1/(k+1)})$, where C_k is an absolute positive constant depends on k only. Let $A^{(N)}_1 = A^{(N)}_0 \cap [1, N/k)$, $A^{(N)}_2 = A^{(N)}_0 \cap [N/k, 2N/k), \ldots,$ $A^{(N)}_k = A^{(N)}_0 \cap [N(k-1)/k, N)$. Any set $A^{(N)}_j$, $j \in [1, 2, \ldots, k]$ has no arithmetic progressions of the length k in $\mathbf{Z}_N$. Clearly, there exists $j \in [1, 2, \ldots, k]$ such that $|A^{(N)}_j| \ge \frac{N}{2k} \exp(-(1+\varepsilon) C_k (\log N)^{1/(k+1)})$. Put $A^{(N)} = A^{(N)}_j$. Using Theorem 1.16, we obtain the dynamical system such that (7) holds for $\rho(n) = \exp(-C_k (1+\varepsilon')(\log n)^{1/(k+1)})$, where ε' can be taken, for example, as 2ε. This completes the proof.

3. On one–dimensional recurrence.

Theorem 3.1 *Let f be a real number, $f \geq 1$, $X = [0,1]$ and μ be Lebesgue measure on X. Then there exists a dynamical system $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T, d)$ such that μ is congruent to Hausdorff measure H_1, $H_1(X) = 1$ and for almost any point $x \in X$*

$$C_f(x) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} \{n \cdot f \cdot d(T^n x, x)\} = 1\,. \tag{15}$$

Note 3.2 Theorem 3.1 was proved in [13] in the case of $f = 1$.

Note 3.3 Let $X = [0,1]$, $\mathcal{B}$ be Borel σ–algebra, μ be Lebesgue measure, T_α be a transformation of X into itself, $T_\alpha x = (x + \alpha) \pmod 1$. Let also $d(x,y) = \|x - y\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the integral distance. There exists a number λ^*, ($\lambda^* = 5,68195..$) such that for all $f \geq \lambda^*$ there is T_α, $\alpha = \alpha(f)$ such that $C_f(x) = 1$ for *all* $x \in [0,1]$. The ray $[\lambda^*, +\infty)$ is called *Hall ray* (see [22]). The explicit value of λ^* was found by G.R. Freiman in [23]. By theorem 3.1 for all $f \geq 1$ (not only for $f \geq \lambda^*$) there exists a dynamical system with $C_f(x) = 1$ for almost all $x \in [0,1]$.

Note 3.4 The inequality $H_1(X) \leq 1$ in Theorem 3.1 is important (see Note 1.17). Besides that the inequality $H_1(X) \geq 1$ is very important too. If this inequality does not hold then Theorem 3.1 is trivial. Indeed, let $f > 1$ and $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T, d)$ be the dynamical system such that $C_1(x) = 1$ for all x (see Note 3.2). Put $\tilde{d}(x,y) = d(x,y)/f$ and consider the new dynamical system $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T, \tilde{d})$. Then for any $x \in X$ we have $C_f(x) = 1$. Note that $H_1(X) = 1/f < 1$ in this dynamical system.

Proof. Let $N_0 = 1$, $N_m = \lceil f 2^m \rceil^2$, $m = 1, 2, \ldots$ and let X be a space of sequences $(x_1, x_2, \ldots)$, $0 \leq x_i < N_i$, $i \geq 1$. There is a correspondence between X and $[0,1]$ is given by $x \to \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_i}{N_0 N_1 \ldots N_i}$. Therefore we can consider the space X to be the segment $[0,1]$. Let also the transformation $T : X \to X$ is given by $Tx = x + 1$, where the addition was defined in the proof of Theorem 1.16 and $1 = (1, 0, 0, \ldots)$. It was noted that T preserves Lebesgue measure μ.

Let $p_m = \sqrt{N_m} = \lceil f 2^m \rceil$, $m \geq 1$ and let

$$A_m^{(j)} = \{x \in [0, 1, \ldots, N_m - 1] \ : \ x \equiv j \pmod{p_m}\}\,.$$

Clearly, $[0, 1, \ldots, N_m - 1]$ is partitioned into the sets $A_m^{(j)}$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, p_m - 1$. Let the mapping $\varphi_j : A_m^{(j)} \to \mathbf{N}_0 = \mathbf{N} \cup \{0\}$ are given by $\varphi_j(x) = (x - j)/p_m$.

If $x \in A_m^{(j)}$ then we put $\varphi(x) := \varphi_j(x)$. It follows that the function $\varphi(x)$ is well–defined on $[0, 1, \dots, N_m - 1]$.

Consider the function

$$d(x,y) = \Big\{ \frac{r_m(x_m, y_m)}{N_0 \dots N_{m-1}} \text{, where } m \text{ is the maximal integer such that}$$

$$x_1 = y_1, \dots, x_{m-1} = y_{m-1} \text{ and there exists } i \in 1, 2, \dots, l(m) \text{ such that}$$

$$x_m, y_m \in A_m^{(i)} \Big\} ,$$

where

$$r_m(x_m, y_m) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{N_m}, & \text{if } x_m = y_m \\ \frac{|\varphi(x_m) - \varphi(y_m)|}{fp_m}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $1/N_m \le r_m(x_m, y_m) \le 1$.

Statement. *$d(x,y)$ is a metric on X.*

Proof of the Statement. Clearly, $d(x,y)$ is a symmetric function and $d(x,y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$. Let us prove that for any $x, y, z \in X$, $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$, $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots)$, $z = (z_1, z_2, \dots)$ we have

$$d(x,y) \le d(x,z) + d(z,y) . \tag{16}$$

If $d(x,y) = 0$ then (16) is trivial. Suppose $d(x,y) > 0$. Then there exists $m \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $d(x,y) = r_m(x_m, y_m)/(N_0 \dots N_{m-1})$. If there exists $i \in 1, 2, \dots, m-1$ such that either $z_i \ne x_i$ or $z_i \ne y_i$ then (16) holds. Therefore we can assume that for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$ we have $z_i = x_i = y_i$.

Suppose that for any j the elements x_m, y_m do not belong to $A_m^{(j)}$. It follows that $d(x,y) = 1/(N_0 \dots N_{m-1})$. On the other hand, either x_m, z_m or y_m, z_m do not belong to the same set $A_m^{(j)}$. Hence (16) holds again.

Suppose x_m and y_m belong to the same set $A_m^{(j)}$. If $z_m \notin A_m^{(j)}$ then (16) holds. If $z_m \in A_m^{(j)}$ then

$$d(x,y) = \frac{|\varphi(x_m) - \varphi(y_m)|}{N_0 \dots N_{m-1} fp_m} \le \frac{|\varphi(x_m) - \varphi(z_m)|}{N_0 \dots N_{m-1} fp_m} + \frac{|\varphi(z_m) - \varphi(y_m)|}{N_0 \dots N_{m-1} fp_m} =$$

$$= d(x,z) + d(z,y) .$$

This completes the proof of the Statement.

Let us return to the proof of Theorem 3.1. Consider Hausdorff measure H_1 on X. Any elementary cylinder is a closed set therefore it is a Borel set in the metric space (X, d). Hence the measure μ is congruent to H_1. We claim that $H_1(X) = 1$.

Consider the sets

$$C(a_1, \ldots, a_m) = \{x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots) \in X \ : \ x_1 = a_1, \ldots, x_m = a_m\} .$$

Obviously, the space X is partitioned into these sets. Hence $H_1(X) \leq 1$.

Let us prove that $H_1(X) \geq 1$. Suppose $H_1(X) = a < 1$. Since $H_1(X) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} H_1^\delta(X) = \sup_{\delta > 0} H_1^\delta(X)$ (see [24] for example) it follows that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$a - \varepsilon < H_1^\delta(X) \leq a = H_1(X) . \tag{17}$$

Let $\varepsilon_0 = (1 - a)/2 > 0$. Using (17) and the definition of Hausdorff measure, we obtain a covering of X by sets $\{U_i\}$, $r_i = \mathrm{diam} U_i$, $r_i < \delta = \delta(\varepsilon_0)$ such that

$$a - \varepsilon < \sum_i \mathrm{diam} U_i = \sum_i r_i < a + \varepsilon . \tag{18}$$

If $a = 0$ then the left–hand side of (18) is not really need.

If $r_i = 0$ then the set U_i is a one–point set, $U_i = \{p_i\}$. Denote by P the union of all one–point sets U_i. In other words, $P = \cup_{\{i : r_i = 0\}} U_i = \cup_i \{p_i\}$. Clearly, there exists U_i does not belong to P. We shall consider only these sets U_i. Since zero is a unique limit point of the set of distances of X it follows that for any U_i there exist two points $x, y \in U_i$ such that $r_i = \mathrm{diam} U_i = d(x, y)$. Let $d(x, y) = r_m(x_m, y_m)/(N_0 \ldots N_{m-1})$. If there exists a number j, $j = j(i)$ such that $x_m, y_m \in A_m^{(j)}$ then put

$$C_i = \{z = (z_1, z_2, \ldots) \in X \ : \ z_1 = x_1, \ldots, z_{m-1} = x_{m-1}, z_m \in A_m^{(j)} \cap [x_m, y_m]\} . \tag{19}$$

If there is not such $A_m^{(j)}$ then we set

$$C_i = \{z = (z_1, z_2, \ldots) \in X \ : \ z_1 = x_1, \ldots, z_{m-1} = x_{m-1}\} , \tag{20}$$

Clearly, in both cases we have $U_i \subseteq C_i$ and $\mathrm{diam} C_i = \mathrm{diam} U_i$. It follows that C_i satisfy (18) and $\{\{C_i\}, P\}$ is a partition of X.

Note that if C_i is given by (20) then C_i is an elementary cylinder. Let

$$C_i(a) = \{z = (z_1, z_2, \ldots) \in X \ : \ z_1 = x_1, \ldots, z_{m-1} = x_{m-1}, z_m = a\} .$$

Then $C_i(a)$ is an elementary cylinder for all a, $0 \leq a < N_m$. If C_i is given by (20) then $C_i = \bigsqcup_{a \in A_m^{(j)} \cap [x_m, y_m]} C_i(a)$. Clearly, $\mathrm{diam} C_i \geq \sum_{a \in A_m^{(j)} \cap [x_m, y_m]} \mathrm{diam} C_i(a)$.

It follows that there exists a countable covering of X by P and elementary cylinders C'_i, $r'_i = \text{diam}C'_i$ such that

$$\sum_i r'_i \le \sum_i r_i < a + \varepsilon < 1\,. \tag{21}$$

Suppose C_1 and C_2 are two elementary cylinders. Then either C_1, C_2 are disjoint or one of them contains another. Therefore there exists a sub–covering C''_i, $r''_i = \text{diam}C''_i$ of the covering C'_i such that C''_i and P is a *partition* of X by elementary cylinders and

$$\sum_i r''_i \le \sum_i r'_i < 1\,. \tag{22}$$

We have $r''_i = \mu C''_i$ and $\sum_i r''_i = \sum_i \mu C''_i = \mu(X) = 1$. This contradicts (22). Hence $H_1(X) = 1$.

Finally, we need to prove for almost all $x \in X$ the following inequality

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\ \{n \cdot f \cdot d(T^n x, x)\} = 1\,. \tag{23}$$

By $a_m(j)$ denote the maximal element of $A_m^{(j)}$. Let $B_m = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{p_m} a_m(j)$. We have $|B_m| = p_m = \sqrt{N_m}$. Let

$$\tilde{B}_m = \{x \in X\ :\ x_m \in B_m\} \subseteq X \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{+\infty} \bigcup_{m\ge n}^{+\infty} \tilde{B}_m\,.$$

Then $\mu(\tilde{B}_m) = |B_m|/N_m = 1/p_m$. We have

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mu(\tilde{B}_m) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_m}} \le \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^m} < \infty\,, \tag{24}$$

Using Borel–Cantelli Lemma, we get $\mu\mathbf{B} = 0$.

Let us prove (23) for all $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots)$, $x \notin \mathbf{B}$. If $x \notin \mathbf{B}$ then there exists $M = M(x)$ such that for all $n \ge M$ we have $x_n \notin B_n$. We can assume that M is a sufficiently large number. There exists a natural m_0 such that $N_0 \ldots N_{m_0} \ge M$. Consider the increasing sequence of natural numbers

$$S = \{p_{m+1} N_0 \ldots N_m\}_{m=m_0}^{+\infty} = \{n_m\}_{m=m_0}^{+\infty}\,.$$

Let $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m, x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \ldots)$, where x_{m+1} belongs to some $A_{m+1}^{(j)}$. Let also $n_m \in S$. Then $T^{n_m} x = (x_1, \ldots, x_m, \tilde{x}_{m+1}, \tilde{x}_{m+2}, \ldots)$, where $\tilde{x}_{m+1}, \tilde{x}_{m+2}, \ldots$

are numbers such that $x_{m+1}, \tilde{x}_{m+1}$ belong to $A^{(j)}_{m+1}$ and $|\varphi(x_{m+1})-\varphi(\tilde{x}_{m+1})| = 1$. It follows that $d(T^{n_m}x, x) = 1/(N_0 \dots N_m f p_{m+1})$. Further,

$$n_m f \cdot d(T^{n_m}x, x) = p_{m+1}N_0 \dots N_m f \frac{1}{N_0 \dots N_m f p_{m+1}} = 1\,. \tag{25}$$

Hence for all $x \notin \mathbf{B}$ we have $C_f(x) \leq 1$.

Prove that for all $x \notin \mathbf{B}$ the inverse inequality holds : $C_f(x) \geq 1$. Let n be a natural number such that $n \in [N_0 \dots N_m, N_0 \dots N_{m+1}) := J_m$ and $m \geq m_0$. Note that n_m belongs to J_m. If $n = tN_0 \dots N_m$, $1 \leq t < N_{m+1}$ then $T^n x = (x_1, \dots, x_m, \tilde{x}_{m+1}, \tilde{x}_{m+2}, \dots)$, where $\tilde{x}_{m+1}, \tilde{x}_{m+2}, \dots$ are numbers. Suppose $\tilde{x}_{m+1} \notin A^{(j)}_{m+1}$ it follows that $d(T^n x, x) = 1/(N_0 \dots N_m)$ and consequently, $nfd(T^n x, x) \geq 1$. If $\tilde{x}_{m+1} \in A^{(j)}_{m+1}$ then $1 = n_m f d(T^{n_m}x, x) \leq nfd(T^n x, x)$.

Finally, suppose that $n \neq tN_0 \dots N_m$, $1 \leq t < N_{m+1}$. In the case $T^n x = (x'_1, \dots, x'_m, x'_{m+1}, x'_{m+2}, \dots)$ and there exists $i \in 1, 2, \dots, m$ such that $x_i \neq x'_i$. It follows that $d(T^n x, x) \geq 1/(N_0 \dots N_m)$ and again $nfd(T^n x, x) \geq 1$.

Thus for any $m \geq m_0$ and an arbitrary $n \in [N_0 \dots N_m, N_0 \dots N_{m+1})$ we have $1 \leq nfd(T^n x, x)$. Whence for any $x \notin \mathbf{B}$ we obtain $C_f(x) \geq 1$. This completes the proof.

References

[1] B.L. van der Waerden, *Beweis einer Baudetschen Vermutung.* // Nieuw Arch. Wisk. 15 (1927), 212–216.

[2] P. Erdös, P. Turán, *On some sequences of integers.* // J. London Math. Soc. 11 (1936), 261–264.

[3] K.F. Roth, *On certain sets of integers.* // J. London Math. Soc. 28 (1953), 245–252.

[4] J. Bourgain, *On triples in arithmetic progression.* // GAFA 9, 1999, 968–984.

[5] E. Szemerédi, *On sets of integers containing no k elements in arithmetic progression.* // Acta Arith. 27 (1975), 299–345.

[6] W.T. Gowers, *A New Proof of Szemerédi's Theorem.* // GAFA 11, 2001, N 3, 465–588.

[7] F.A. Behrend, *On sets of integers which contain no three terms in arithmetical progression.* // Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., 23, 331–332, 1946.

[8] R.A. Rankin, *Sets of Integers Containing not more than a Given Number of Terms in Arithmetic Progression.* // Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh, v. 65, N.4, Sec. A, 332–344, 1961.

[9] I. Laba, M.T. Lacey, *On Sets of Integers Not Containing Long Arithmetic Progressions.* // http:// www.arXiv:math.CO/0108155, 2001.

[10] J.H. Poincaré, *Les méthodes nouvelles de la mécanique céleste.* V. 2. Paris, 1892–1899.

[11] H. Furstenberg, *Recurrence in Ergodic Theory and Combinatorial Number Theory.* // Princeton (N.J.), 1981.

[12] H. Furstenberg, Y. Katznelson and D. Ornstein, *The Ergodic Theoretical Proof of Szemerédi Theorem.* // Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., v. 7, N.3, 527–552, 1982.

[13] M. Boshernitzan, *Quantitative recurrence results.* // Inventiones mathematicae, Vol. 113, Fasc. 3, 1993, 617–631.

[14] N.G. Moshchevitin, *On a Theorem of Poincaré.* // Uspehi Matematicheskih Nauk, v. 53, N. 1, 1999, 223 – 224.

[15] I.D. Shkredov, *On Recurrence in Average.* // Matematicheskie Zametki 72, N 4 (2002) 625–632.

[16] I.D. Shkredov, *On one problem of Gowers.* // Doklady of Russian Academy of Sciences, v. 400, N 2, 2005, 169–172.

[17] I.D. Shkredov, *On one problem of Gowers.* // http:// www.arXiv:math.NT/0405406, 2004.

[18] I.D. Shkredov, *On Multiple Recurrence.* // http:// www.arXiv:math.DS/0406413, 2004.

[19] I.D. Shkredov, *On a Generalization of Szemerédi's Theorem.* // http:// www.arXiv : math.NT/0503639, 2005.

[20] C.L. Stewart, R. Tijdeman, *On Infinite–Difference Sets.* // Can. J. Math., Vol. 31, No. 5, 1979, p. 897–910.

[21] T. Tao, *Lecture notes 5.* // http://math.ucla.edu/ tao/254a.1.03w/notes5.dvi

[22] T.W. Cusick, M.E. Flahive, *The Markoff and Lagrange Spectra.* / Mathematical surveys and monographs, Number 30, Published by AMS, Providence, Rhode Island.

[23] G.A. Freiman, *Diophantine Approximation and Geometry of Numbers (The Markoff Spectrum).* / Kalininskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet, Moscow, 1975.

[24] K. Falconer, *Fractal Geometry. Mathematical Foundations and Applications.* / New York: Wiley, 1990.